

b.) Remarks

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite the subject matter of the present invention with the specificity required by statute. Additionally, new claims 16-18 are presented in order to more specifically recite various preferred embodiments of the present invention. For the Examiner's convenience, the subject matter of the amendment may be found in the specification as filed, at page 10, lines 23-24. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hingsen-Gehrmann (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0142121) in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0135735) as evidenced by Arton Property Tables, all of record.

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hingsen-Gehrmann in view of Yamamoto and further in view of Koike (U.S. Patent No. 6,201,045) and claim 8 is rejected as being obvious over Hingsen-Gehrmann in view of Yamamoto and Nito (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,411) or Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 7,582,355), also of record.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Prior to setting forth their bases for traversal, however, Applicants would briefly like to discuss the salient features of the present invention and, *inter alia*, its patentable nature over the prior art.

As the Examiner is well-aware, the present invention relates to a retroreflective sheeting provided with a destructive layer comprising an alicyclic polyolefin or alicyclic acrylic resin. As specified in the amended claims, the resin has a molecular weight range of 1,000 - 100,000 as converted to molecular weight of styrene.

In that regard, Applicants have determined that when the molecular weight of the resin exceeds 100,000, the resin is too hard and is not easily destroyed when the retroreflective sheeting is removed (peeled off) a substrate, as taught at page 10, lines 20-22.

These features are not addressed by any of the prior art whether taken singly or collectively. Moreover, these features are also not taught in the prior art to be result-effective variables. At least for these reasons, therefore, the present invention as recited in the currently-amended claims is unobvious and patentable over the prior art.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the Examiner's concerns are now overcome and the claims are now in allowable condition. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-5, 8-10 and 12-18 remain presented for continued prosecution.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence S. Perry/
Lawrence S. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,865

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
LSP\ac